6 MAY 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR: Acting Deputy Director for Support

SUBJECT : Summary of Critiques and Recommendations for Supervisory Responsibilities Program

- 1. Paragraph 7 contains recommendations for the approval of the Asting Deputy Director for Support.
- 2. This office received twenty three critiques of the Supervisory of Responsibilities Program in response to the request of the Deputy of Director for Support in his memorandum of April 1964. Every major organizational element of the Support Directorate is represented in this response with additional comments having been received from representatives from the DDI, DEET and the Office of the Executive Director.
  - 3. The areas of near unanisous agreement are those:

DECLASS!

IN CLASS/ DEC NEXT REV DATE

R.O.

- program is desirable and worthy of further pursuit.
- b. It is too long as it is presently constituted and, at times, too repetitive.
- h. Areas of general, but not unanimous agreement are these:
- a. The presence of so many key officials on the platform in this type of program was unique and gave many supervisors their first opportunity to see and hear officers at this level. Many regarded this as a significant item in itself and felt that it strengthened the identification of line supervisors with Agency management.
- b. Rome presentations were regulation oriented and failed to make adequate use of examples or case histories.
- c. Most speakers placed too little emphasis on leadership and employee development.
- d. The program lacked a unified concept of what was wrong with Agency supervision.

STERRI

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic downgrasing and declassification

- e. The purpose of the program was not apparent throughout and the complimentary character of many of the early remarks made many supervisors wonder why they were there.
- f. Some talks were not well presented. They failed to make use of visual sids or other pedagogic devices.
- g. The material on Security, although well presented, was not appropriate to the experience level of the audience.
- h. The panel technique used at the conclusion was very effective.
- 5. Factors on which a few people agreed are these:
  - a. The acoustics in the auditorium is poor.
- b. The program attempted to address itself to too wide a grade range.
- c. The program should be an annual affair or there should be follow-up workshops.
- 6. In direct response to the questions posed by the Deputy Director for Support with respect to this program, it is possible to conclude that the program was extremely useful to the participants; that it was too long and that the individual presentations would benefit from some condensation; that the format of the program was acceptable; and that the substance of the presentations were generally to the point but suffered from a lack of specific applications to supervisory problems. In reviewing the critiques we were unable to discern any marked difference between the opinions of senior supervisors and junior supervisors as to the value of the program.
- 7. On the basis of these reactions the Office of Training recommends:
  - a. That the Supervisory Responsibilities Program be continued and extended to include all of the Deputy Directorates of this Agency.
  - b. That the program be condensed to permit completion on a one-half day schedule.

- c. That the second offering of this program for DDS supervisors be scheduled for the week of 25 May utilizing the program outlined in Attachment A.
- d. That schedules for other Deputy Directorates be developed for the month of June utilizing the program in Attachment B.

	il be pleased to to discuss the			
designated Mr.			m Coordinato	
this activity.		•		

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

Acting Director of Training

Attachments: A & B

The recommendations contained in puragraph 7 are approved;

H. Cates Lloyd Acting Deputy Director for Support Date

25X1A9a

TR/PPS :hj (6 May 1964) Distribution:

O - DIR

2 X - ADD/S

1 - TR/R

1 - TR/MT

2 - DIR (1 w/b)

1 - TR/PPS (v/h)

SECRET

